Calendar No. 812

98TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
98–419

LAND ACQUISITION AT SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MICH.

MAY 1 (legislative day APRIL 30), 1984.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MCCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1868]

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to which was referred the bill (S. 1868) to add $17,996,558 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendments and an amendment to the title and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

1. On page 1, line 6, after (Public Law 91–479; 16 U.S.C. 460X–14), delete "is" and insert in lieu thereof "as amended, is further".
2. On page 1, line 7, delete "$66,153,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,149,558".
3. Amend the title so as to read:

A bill to add $2,000,000 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1868, as reported, is to increase the land acquisition authorization ceiling at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich., by $2,000,000.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

Since the introduction of S. 1868, Congress in Public Law 98–141 increased the ceiling on appropriations for land acquisition at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich., from $66,153,000 to $82,149,558.

31–010 O

S313-9

There is a tract of approximately 265 acres remaining to be acquired to complete public ownership within the lakeshore. The owner of the parcel is anxious to convey the tract to the United States, citing financial hardship since he is effectively prohibited from developing the property. The National Park Service has not made any appraisal of the properties remaining to be acquired. The new ceiling set by S. 1868 is $84,149,558 an increase of $2,000,000 over the presently authorized level.

Legislative History

S. 1868 was introduced by Senator Riegle (for himself and Senator Levin) on September 21, 1983. A hearing on S. 1868 was held on October 6, 1983, before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water. The administration does not support an increase in the present authorized level.

At an open business session on April 25, 1984, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources ordered S. 1868 favorably reported with amendments to text and title.

Committee Recommendations and Tabulation of Votes

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, in open business session on April 25, 1984, by unanimous vote of a quorum present recommends that the Senate pass S. 1868, if amended, as described herein.

The rollcall vote on reporting the measure was 18 yeas and 0 nays as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Mr. McClure	
Mr. Hatfield [1]	
Mr. Domenici [1]	
Mr. Wallop [1]	
Mr. Warner	
Mr. Murkowski	
Mr. Nickles	
Mr. Hecht	
Mr. Chafee [1]	
Mr. Evans	
Mr. Johnston	
Mr. Bumpers	
Mr. Ford	
Mr. Metzenbaum	
Mr. Matsunaga [1]	
Mr. Melcher	
Mr. Bradley	
Mr. Levin [1]	

[1] Indicates voted by proxy.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments to S. 1868 are technical in nature and were made to reflect changes necessitated by congressional action in Public Law 98–141, which authorized a $15,996,558 addition to the previous budget ceiling.

The first amendment adopted by the committee is to correct the language to accurately portray that the original authorization (Public Law 91–479) has been amended previously.

The second committee amendment reflects the budget ceiling as authorized in the most recent legislation, Public Law 98–141, which was enacted after S. 1868 was introduced.

The third amendment changes the title, again to more accurately reflect the true budget ceiling needed to complete acquisition on the lakeshore following enactment of Public Law 98–141 which raised the authorized ceiling to $82,149,558.

COST AND BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS

The following estimate of the cost of this measure has been provided by the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1984.

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for S. 1868, a bill to add $2,000,000 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

ERIC HANUSHEK
(For Rudolph G. Penner, Director).

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

APRIL 27, 1984.

1. Bill number: S. 1868.
2. Bill title: A bill to add $2,000,000 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bar Dunes National Lakeshore.
3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, April 25, 1984.
4. Bill purpose: S. 1868 raises the authorization ceiling for land acquisition at Sleeping Bear from $82 million to $84 million in order

to provide for the purchase of an additional parcel of land. As of the end of fiscal year 1984 approximately $64 million will have been appropriated for Sleeping Bear. The President's 1985 budget request contains $7.9 million for Sleeping Bear for the payment of condemnation awards.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government.

	Millions
Authorization level:	
Fiscal year:	
1985	$2
1986	-----
1987	-----
1988	-----
1989	-----
Estimated outlays:	
Fiscal year:	
1985	2
1986	-----
1987	-----
1988	-----
1989	-----

The cost of this bill fall within budget function 300.

Basis of estimate: For purposes of this estimate, it is assumed that S. 1868 will be enacted by June 1984. It is further assumed that the entire $2 million will be appropriated prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1985 and that the Department of the Interior will purchase the additional parcel of land during the year.

6. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

7. Estimated comparison: None.

8. Previous CBO estimate: None.

9. Estimate prepared by: Deb Reis.

10. Estimated approved by: C. G. Nuckols, for James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Regulatory Impact Evaluation

In compliance with paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the committee makes the following evaluation of the regulatory impact which would be incurred in carrying out S. 1868. The bill is not a regulatory measure in the sense of imposing Government-established standards or significant economic responsibilities on private individuals and businesses.

No personal information would be collected in administering the program. Therefore, there would be no impact on personal privacy.

Little, if any, additional paperwork would result from the enactment of S. 1868 as reported.

Executive Communications

The pertinent legislative reports received by the committee from the Department of the Interior setting forth executive agency recommendations relating to S. 1868 are set forth below:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1984.

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your request for our views on S. 1868, a bill "To add $17,996,558 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore."

We do not recommend the enactment of this legislation.

S. 1868 would increase the ceiling on appropriations for land acquisition at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich., from $66,153,000 to $84,149,558, an increase of $17,996,558. We are requesting an increase of only $15,996,558, however, in order to cover our appropriation request in the President's budget. We would support, therefore, a new ceiling for Sleeping Bear Dunes of $82,149,558 but we could not support S. 1868, which authorizes $2 million over and above that figure. Moreover, for the last two fiscal years (fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984) the Congress has deleted from the President's budget request a total of $20.4 million for anticipated court awards for land acquisition at Sleeping Bear Dunes. To authorize an additional $2 million therefore seems inconsistent.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. CRAIG POTTER,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill S. 1868 as ordered reported are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PUBLIC LAW 91-479 (84 STAT. 1075), SEC. 15 OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 21, 1970, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 97-361 (96 STAT. 1724)—OCTOBER 22, 1982; AND BY PUBLIC LAW 98-141 (97 STAT. 909)—OCTOBER 31, 1983

AN ACT To establish in the State of Michigan, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes

* * * * * * *

SEC. 15. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than [$82,149,000] *$84,149,558* for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than $18,769,000 (June 1970 prices) for development, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved herein.

○

Calendar No. 813

98TH CONGRESS *2d Session* } SENATE { REPORT 98–420

DESIGNATING WILDCAT BROOK IN NEW HAMPSHIRE FOR STUDY AS A WILD AND SCENIC RIVER

MAY 1 (legislative day, APRIL 30), 1984.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MCCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2095]

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to which was referred the bill (S. 2095) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wildcat River for study as a National Wild and Scenic River, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and an amendment to the title and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

1. On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike "(Public Law 96–542: 16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is" and insert in lieu thereof, "(Public Law 90–542; 82 Stat. 906, as amended) is further".

2. On page 1, line 6, after the word "Wildcat" delete the word "River," and insert in lieu thereof, "Brook,".

3. On page 1, line 7, after the word "headwaters" insert the following, "including the principal tributaries".

4. On page 1, line 7, strike "River." ." and insert:

> River. The study authorized in this paragraph shall be completed no later than two years from the date of enactment of this paragraph and an interim report shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress no later than one year from the date of enactment of this paragraph."

5. Amend the title so as to read:

A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wildcat Brook for study as a National Wild and Scenic River

31–010 O

S313-10

Purpose

The purpose of S. 2095 as reported is to add the Wildcat Brook in the State of New Hampshire to the list of rivers to be studied for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.

Background

Wildcat Brook is listed in the Nationwide Rivers Inventory as a river deserving study. The headwaters of this river are to be found within the White Mountain National Forest, and reach up Carter Notch to the sides of the Wildcat Mountain and the Carter Range. As the river gains volume and momentum, it traces its way through the town of Jackson, N.H., and tumbles over one of the most scenic and accessible falls in New England. Known for both its scenic and recreational values, the Wildcat Brook is a source of much pride and also a central attraction in the town of Jackson, N.H.

Legislative History

S. 2095 was introduced on November 14, 1983. A hearing before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water was held on S. 2095 on March 6, 1984. The administration in testimony does not support enactment of S. 2095. In an open business session on April 25, 1984, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources ordered S. 2095 favorably reported with amendments to the text and to the title.

Committee Recommendations and Tabulation of Votes

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, in open business session on April 25, 1984, by unanimous vote of a quorum present recommends that the Senate pass S. 2095, if amended as described herein.

The rollcall vote on reporting the measure was 18 yeas and 0 nays as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Mr. McClure	
Mr. Hatfield [1]	
Mr. Domenici [1]	
Mr. Wallop [1]	
Mr. Warner	
Mr. Murkowski	
Mr. Nickles	
Mr. Hecht	
Mr. Chaffee [1]	
Mr. Evans	
Mr. Johnston	
Mr. Bumpers	
Mr. Ford	
Mr. Metzenbaum	
Mr. Matsunaga [1]	
Mr. Melcher	
Mr. Bradley	
Mr. Levin [1]	

[1] Indicates voted by proxy.

Committee Amendments

The committee made five amendments to S. 2095 as introduced.

Amendment No. 1 corrects the public law and statute citation.

Amendment No. 2 conforms the name of the river to the properly designated name of "Wildcat Brook".

The third amendment clarifies the area to be studied by including the principal tributaries of Wildcat Brook.

The fourth amendment specifies a 2-year study period for Wildcat Brook.

The fifth amendment changes the title of the bill to reflect the properly designated name as "Wildcat Brook."

The National Park Service, through its technical assistance program, has extensive experience in State and local river conservation planning and should be the lead agency conducting this wild and scenic river study. The North Atlantic Regional Office of the National Park Service, with the assistance of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office and the Denver Service Center, would be the appropriated lead office to conduct the study. The committee expects that the National Park Service will work in close consultation and cooperation with the USDA-Forest Service in conducting the study.

The committee feels the study should give emphasis to State and local government and landowner protection alternatives for the Wildcat Brook, including an assessment of the feasibility of designating the river as part of the national system the provision of section 2(a)(ii) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. If the section 2(a)(ii) option is determined to be feasible, an environmental impact assessment which conforms with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act should be prepared for the proposed designation action. Given the land ownership pattern and the needs of the local community, it is the committee's expectation that Federal land acquisition will not be necessary to protect the river, should it be designated as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It is the committee's expectation that a strategy which emphasizes a Federal-State-local government and private landowner partnership would enjoy the greatest likelihood of success in protecting the river, and the National Park Service is strongly encouraged to develop a strategy in close consultation with the State emphasizing this approach.

Cost and Budgetary Considerations

The following estimate of costs of this measure has been provided by the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. Congress,
Congressional Budget Office,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1984.

Hon. James A. McClure,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed S. 2095, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wildcat River for study as a national wild and scenic river, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, April 25, 1984.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study of Wildcat Brook, New Hampshire, for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The study is to be completed within 2 years of enactment of this bill. Based on information from the National Forest Service, it is estimated that the study will cost $50,000 to $75,000 over the 2-year period. It is possible that the State of New Hampshire will cooperate in this effort because over one-half of the area to be studied is not on federal land. If this occurs, the total federal cost will be reduced.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

ERIC HANUSHEK
(For Rudolph G. Penner).

REGULATORY IMPACT EVALUATION

In compliance with paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the committee makes the following evaluation of the regulatory impact which would be incurred carrying out S. 2095.

The bill is not a regulatory measure in the sense of imposing Government-established standards or significant economic responsibilities on private individuals and businesses. No personal information would be collected in administering the program. Therefore, there would be no impact on personal privacy.

Little, if any additional paperwork would result from the enactment of S. 2095.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The pertinent legislative reports and communications received by the committee from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture setting forth executive agency recommendations relating to S. 2095 are set forth below:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1984.

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your request for our views on S. 2095, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wildcat River for study as a national wild and scenic river.

We defer to the views of the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service on enactment of this legislation.

S. 2095 would designate the Wildcat River (also called Wildcat Brook) in New Hampshire for study as a potential component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The National Park Service identified Wildcat Brook in New Hampshire in the 1982 Nationwide Rivers Inventory. Our inventory found the river from its headwaters to the confluence with the Ellis River to be a regionally significant

whitewater stream possessing class IV and V rapids, with easy access. We noted that this 10-mile river has been rated as one of the five best whitewater rivers in New England.

Inasmuch as the first 3 or 4 miles of the stream are within the boundaries of the White Mountain National Forest, we defer to the views of the U.S. Forest Service as to the enactment of S. 2095.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

G. RAY ARNETT,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1984.

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR CHAIRMAN: As you requested, here is our report on S. 2095, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wildcat River for study as a national wild and scenic river.

The Department of Agriculture recommends that S. 2095 not be enacted.

S. 2095 would designate the Wildcat River in New Hampshire for study as a wild and scenic river. The study would be from the river's headwaters to its confluence with the Ellis River—a distance of approximately 10 miles.

Of the approximately 10 miles of proposed river study, only 3 miles are within the White Mountain National Forest boundary. The remaining 7 miles are bounded by lands in private ownership. The values of the portion of the river within the boundary of the White Mountain National Forest are being protected under existing statutes and related management plans. We believe protection of the river outside the national forest boundary is more appropriately a State responsibility. In view of this, we do not support S. 2095. If the State of New Hampshire passes legislation designating the Wildcat River as a wild, scenic or recreational river, utilization of the process outlined in section 2(a)(ii) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act would be the preferred method for including the Wildcat River in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and providing for State management of the lower portion of the river. We would cooperate with the State and manage the portion within the national forest boundary in a compatible manner.

We estimate that the cost of the study proposed in the bill would be $50,000.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BLOCK,
Secretary.

Changes in Existing Law

In compliance with paragraph 12 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, S. 2095, as ordered reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Act of October 2, 1968 (P.L. 90–542, 82 Stat. 906, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1271(note), 1271–1287)

POTENTIAL ADDITIONS

Sec. 5. (a) The following rivers are hereby designated for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system:

(1) Allegheny, Pennsylvania: The segment from its mouth to the town of East Brady, Pennsylvania.

(2) Bruneau, Idaho: The entire main stem.

(3) Buffalo, Tennessee: The entire river.

(4) Chattooga, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia: The entire river.

(5) Clarion, Pennsylvania: The segment between Ridgway and its confluence with the Allegheny River.

(6) Delaware, Pennsylvania and New York: The segment from Hancock, New York, to Matamoras, Pennsylvania.

(7) Flathead, Montana: The North Fork from the Canadian border downstream to its confluence with the Middle Fork; the Middle Fork from its headwaters to its confluence with the South Fork; and the South Fork from its origin to Hungry Horse Reservoir.

(8) Gasconade, Missouri: The entire river.

(9) Illinois, Oregon: The entire river.

(10) Little Beaver, Ohio: The segment of the North and Middle Forks of the Little Beaver River in Columbiana County from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio.

(11) Little Miami, Ohio: That segment of the main stem of the river, exclusive of its tributaries, from a point at the Warren-Clermont County line at Loveland, Ohio, upstream to the sources of Little Miami including North Fork.

(12) Maumee, Ohio and Indiana: The main stem from Perrysburg, Ohio, to Fort Wayne, Indiana, exclusive of its tributaries in Ohio and inclusive of its tributaries in Indiana.

(13) Missouri, Montana: The segment between Fort Benton and Ryan Island.

(14) Moyie, Idaho: The segment from the Canadian border to its confluence with the Kootenai River.

(15) Obed, Tennessee: The entire river and its tributaries, Clear Creek and Daddys Creek.

(16) Penobscot, Maine: Its east and west branches.

(17) Pere Marquette, Michigan: The entire river.

(18) Pine Creek, Pennsylvania: The segment from Ansonia to Waterville.

(19) Priest, Idaho: The entire main stem.

(20) Rio Grande, Texas: The portion of the river between the west boundary of Hudspeth County and the east boundary of Terrell County on the United States side of the river: *Provided*, That before undertaking any study of this potential scenic river, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine, through the channels of appropriate executive agencies, that Mexico has no objection to its being included among the studies authorized by this Act.

(21) Saint Croix, Minnesota and Wisconsin: The segment between the dam near Taylors Falls and its confluence with the Mississippi River.

(22) Saint Joe, Idaho: The entire main stem.

(23) Salmon, Idaho: The segment from the town of North Fork to its confluence with the Snake River.

(24) Skagit, Washington: The segment from the town of Mount Vernon to and including the mouth of Bacon Creek; the Cascade River between its mouth and the junction of its North and South Forks; the South Fork to the boundary of the Glacier Peak Wilderness Areas; the Suiattle River from its mouth to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area boundary at Milk Creek; the Sauk River from its mouth to its junction with Elliott Creek; the North Fork of the Sauk River from its junction with the South Fork of the Sauk to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area boundary.

(25) Suwannee, Georgia and Florida: The entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

(26) Upper Iowa, Iowa: The entire river.

(27) Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania: The segment from Oakland, Maryland, to the Youghiogheny Reservoir, and from the Youghiogheny Dam downstream to the town of Connellsville, Pennsylvania.

(28) American, California: The North Fork from the Cedars to the Auburn Reservoir.

(29) Au Sable, Michigan: The segment downstream from Foot Dam to Oscoda and upstream from Loud Reservoir to its source, including its principal tributaries and excluding Mio and Bamfield reservoirs.

(30) Big Thompson, Colorado: The segment from its source to the boundary of Rocky Mountain National Park.

(31) Cache la Poudre, Colorado: Both forks from their sources to their confluence, thence the Cache la Poude to the eastern boundary of Roosevelt National Forest.

(32) Cahaba, Alabama: The segment from its junction with United States Highway 31 south of Birmingham downstream to its junction with United States Highway 80 west of Selma.

(33) Clarks Fork, Wyoming: The segment from the Clark's Fork Canyon to the Crandall Creek Bridge.

(34) Colorado, Colorado and Utah: The segment from its confluence with the Dolores River, Utah, upstream to a point 19.5 miles from the Utah-Colorado border in Colorado.

(35) Conejos, Colorado: The three forks from their sources to their confluence, thence the Conejos to its first junction with State Highway 17, excluding Platoro Reservoir.

(36) Elk, Colorado: The segment from its source to Clark.

(37) Encampment, Colorado: The Main Fork and West Fork to their confluence, thence the Encampment to the Colorado-Wyoming border, including the tributaries and headwaters.

(38) Green, Colorado: The entire segment within the State of Colorado.

(39) Gunnison, Colorado: The segment from the upstream (southern) boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument to its confluence with the North Fork.

(40) Illinois, Oklahoma: The segment from Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir upstream to the Arkansas-Oklahoma border, including the Flint and Barren Fork Creeks.

(41) John Day, Oregon: The main stem from Service Creek Bridge (at river mile 157) downstream to Tumwater Falls (at river mile 10).

(42) Kettle, Minnesota: The entire segment within the State of Minnesota.

(43) Los Pinos, Colorado: The segment from its source, including the tributaries and headwaters within the San Juan Primitive Area, to the northern boundary of the Granite Peak Ranch.

(44) Manistee, Michigan: The entire river from its source to Manistee Lake, including its principal tributaries and excluding Tippy and Hodenpyl Reservoirs.

(45) Nolichuckey, Tennessee and North Carolina: The entire main stem.

(46) Owyhee, South Fork, Oregon: The main stem from the Oregon-Idaho border downstream to the Owhyhee Reservoir.

(47) Piedra, Colorado: The Middle Fork and East Fork from their sources to their confluence, thence to the Piedra to its junction with Colorado Highway 10.

(48) Shepaug, Connecticut. The entire river.

(49) Sipsey Fork, West Fork, Alabama: The segment, including its tributaries, from the impoundment formed by the Lewis M. Smith Dam upstream to its source in the William B. Bankhead National Forest.

(50) Snake, Wyoming: The segment from the southern boundaries of Teton National Park to the entrance to Palisades Reservoir.

(51) Sweetwater, Wyoming: The segment from Wilson Bar downstream to Spring Creek.

(52) Tuolumne, California: The main river from its source on Mount Dana and Mount Lyell in Yosemite National Park to Don Pedro Reservoir.

(53) Upper Mississippi, Minnesota: The sgment from its source at the outlet of Itasca Lake to its junction with the northwestern boundary of the city of Anoka.

(54) Wisconsin, Wisconsin: The segment from Prairie du Sac to its confluence with the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien.

(55) Yampa, Colorado: The segment within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument.

(56) Dolores, Colorado: The segment of the main stem from Rico upstream to its source, including its headwaters; the West Dolores from its source, including its headwaters, downstream to its confluence with the main stem; and the segment from the west boundary, section 2, township 38 north, range 16 west, NMPM, below the proposed

McPhee Dam, downstream to the Colorado-Utah border, excluding the segment from one mile above Highway 90 to the confluence of the San Miguel River.

(57) Snake, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho: The segment from an eastward extension of the north boundary of section 1, township 5 north range 47 east, Williamette meridian, downstream to the town of Asotin, Washington.

(58) Housatonic, Connecticut: The segment from the Massachusetts-Connecticut boundary downstream to its confluence with the Shepaug River.

(59) Kern, California: The main stem of the North Fork from its source to Isabelle Reservoir excluding its tributaries.

(60) Loxahatchee, Florida: The entire river including its tributary, North Fork.

(61) Ogeechee, Georgia: The entire river.

(62) Salt, Arizona: The main stem from a point on the north side of the river intersected by the Fort Apache Indian reservation boundary (north of Buck Mountain) downstream to Arizona State Highway 288.

(63) Verde, Arizona: The main stem from the Prescott National Forest boundary near Paulden to the vicinity of Table Mountain, approximately 14 miles above Horseshoe Reservoir, except for the segment not included in the national forest between Clarksdale and Camp Verde, North segment.

(64) San Francisco, Arizona: The main stem from confluence with the Gila upstream to the Arizona-New Mexico border, except for the segment between Clifton and the Apache National forest.

(65) Fish Creek, New York: The entire East Branch.

(66) Black Creek, Mississippi: The segment from Big Creek Landing in Forrest County downstream to Old Alexander Bridge Landing in Stone County.

(67) Allegheny, Pennsylvania: The main stem from Kinzua Dam downstream to East Brady.

(68) Cacapon, West Virginia: The entire river.

(69) Escatawpa, Alabama and Mississippi: The segment upstream from a point approximately one mile downstream from the confluence of the Escatawpa River and Jackson Creek to a point where the Escatawpa River is joined by the Yellowstone Branch in Washington County, Alabama, near the town of Deer Park, Alabama; and the segment of Brushy Creek upstream from it confluence with the Escatawpa to its confluence with Scarsborough Creek.

(70) Myakka, Florida: The segment south of the southern boundary of the Myakka River State Park.

(71) Soldier Creek, Alabama: The segment beginning at the point where Soldier Creek intersects the south line of section 31, township 7 south, range 6 east, downstream to a point on the south line of section 6, township 8 south, range 6 east, which point is 1,322 feet west of the south line of section 5, township 8 south, range 6 east in the county of Baldwin, State of Alabama.

(72) Red Kentucky: The segment from Highway numbered 746 (also known as Spradlin Bridge) in Wolf County, Kentucky, downstream to the point where the river descends below seven hundred feet

above sea level (in its normal flow) which point is at the Menifee and Powell County line just downstream of the iron bridge where Kentucky Highway numbered 77 passes over the river.

(73) Bluestone, West Virginia: From its headwaters to its confluence with the New.

(74) Gauley, West Virginia: Including the tributaries of the Meadow and the Cranberry, from the headwaters to its confluence with the New.

(75) Greenbrier, West Virginia: From its headwaters to its confluence with the New.

(76) Birch, West Virginia: The main stem from the Cora Brown Bridge in Nicholas County to the confluence of the river with the Elk River in Braxton County.

(77) Colville, Alaska.

(78) Etivluk-Nigu, Alaska.

(79) Utukok, Alaska.

(80) Kanektok, Alaska.

(81) Kisaralik, Alaska.

(82) Melozitna, Alaska.

(83) Sheenjek (lower segment), Alaska.

(84) Situk, Alaska.

(85) Porcupine, Alaska.

(86) Yukon (Ramparts section), Alaska.

(87) Squirrel, Alaska.

(88) Koyuk, Alaska.

(89) *Wildcat Brook, New Hampshire: The segment from its headwaters including the principal tributaries to its confluence with the Ellis River. The study authorized in this paragraph shall be completed no later than two years from the date of enactment of this paragraph and an interim report shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress no later than one year from the date of enactment of this paragraph.*

○